

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis and requests reconsideration of the final rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 5-9, 13-16, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated Jamieson et al. (U.S.5,810,120). The Examiner argues that Applicants comments in the first response amount to nothing more than an assertion of patentability. However, this is not the case.

Claims 1 and 9 include the limitation that a roller includes a hardness that varies responsive to a magnetic field. Claim 16 requires the step of varying a hardness of at least one roller.

The Jamieson et al. devices provides an active roller guide that varies a force on a roller, not a hardness of a roller as is required by claim 1. In Jamieson the roller guide, not the roller is varied. (Col 3, lines 44-49). Note that in Figure 1, of Jamieson et al. the rollers 30 and 32 merely provide contact between the elevator car and the guide rails 16, 14. The solenoids 22 and 24, and electromagnets 34, 36 provide adjustment and variability, not the rollers 30 and 32. There is no mechanism, structure or disclosure that teaches varying a hardness of a roller disclosed in Jamieson et al.

The Examiner has provided a definition of hardness as being the property of being rigid and resistant to pressure. Applicant agrees with this definition and asks the Examiner to identify where in the Jamieson et al. reference it discloses changing the hardness or resistance to pressure of a roller required to support this anticipation rejection. As appreciated, Jamieson et al. discloses changes to a force exerted on the roller, but does not disclose any feature, structure, or function that changes the properties of any of the rollers themselves.

Accordingly, the Jamieson et al. reference does not disclose, or suggest varying a hardness of the roller itself and therefore cannot anticipate the limitations present in the claims. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Further claims 2, 3, 10, 17, and 18 were rejected as being obvious over Jamieson in view of Yoshiaki (JP5-116869 (“Yoshiaki”). Jamieson et al. does not disclose or suggest varying hardness of a roller for the reasons discussed above. The proposed modification in view of Yoshiaki does not correct this deficiency. Yoshiaki discloses a magnetic fluid 22 housed within a damper device 20. The magnetic fluid 22 in Yoshiaki does not, however, vary a *hardness* of the roller guide 10. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Accordingly, the claims are believed in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will be useful to move this case forward toward issue, Applicant's representative will be happy to discuss any issues regarding this application and can be contacted at the telephone number indicated below. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any necessary fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: /John M. Siragusa/
John M. Siragusa
Registration No. 46,174
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: December 10, 2007